



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STENOGRAPHER IN GRAND JURY ROOM.—In a late Maine case, *State v. Bowman*, 38 Atl. Rep. 331, it appeared that an official court stenographer was present, at the request of the county attorney and by express order of the court, at a meeting of the grand jury, and assisted the county attorney by taking stenographic notes of the testimony, retiring, however, before the jury began to deliberate. It was held that the presence of the stenographer invalidated the indictment found under those circumstances. The Supreme Court of Indiana, on the other hand, in a still more recent decision, *State v. Bates*, 48 N. E. Rep. 2, held that the presence of a stenographer employed by the prosecuting attorney was not, in the absence of proof that the accused was prejudiced thereby, sufficient ground for quashing an indictment. The court, in the latter case, considered that the attendance of a stenographer at a meeting of the grand jury was not inconsistent with the due administration of justice in criminal cases, since he was, in effect, an assistant of the prosecuting attorney.

The position taken by the Indiana court seems to be clearly in accordance with the weight of authority and with enlightened methods of procedure. While it is almost universally the law that only members of the grand jury shall be present at its deliberations, it is generally held perfectly proper for the prosecuting attorney or his assistants to be present at the hearing of evidence. The view of the court in *State v. Bates*, that a stenographer comes within the description of an assistant to the prosecuting attorney, seems clearly right on principle, and is supported by federal decisions. It is conceived, furthermore, that on this point no valid distinction can be drawn between the two cases under consideration. While the stenographer, in *State v. Bowman*, was a court official, and was present in the grand jury room by the express order of the judge, he was there, nevertheless, as the assistant of the county attorney.

The grand jury usually selects one of its own number as clerk; yet few jurymen are competent to take notes in longhand rapidly and accurately, and fewer still have any knowledge whatever of stenography. As a practical matter, therefore, it would seem to be not only proper, but necessary, especially in cases where the evidence is technical or involved, to call in the services of an expert stenographer. Moreover, were care exercised in the selection of stenographers, it is believed that the chances of maintaining secrecy in regard to the transactions of the grand jury would not be materially lessened. It is difficult to see, also, why the presence of a stenographer at the taking of evidence should interfere with the free exchange of views among the jurymen, when discussion by the jury is reserved until after the stenographer, attorney, and witnesses have all retired. Furthermore, if the accused could show that he had been injured by the presence of the stenographer, he would be entitled, under the Indiana rule, to ask for the quashing of the indictment.

LABEL OF VESSEL FOR SEAMAN'S WAGES.—The peculiar conditions in which the master of a vessel and his sailors are placed during a voyage, the necessity for unrestrained authority on the one hand and implicit obedience on the other, as requisite to the general safety of all, have probably contributed much to the differences, as to the rights of the parties to contracts, between those made under maritime law and those made under common law. Thus, until a change was made by statute, the wages